IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Crl.Misc.No.76812-M of 2006

DATE OF DECISION: DECEMBER 7, 2006

Harbant Singh

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

State of Punjab and others

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SATISH KUMAR MITTAL

Present: Mr. K.S.Hissowal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

...

The petitioner has filed this petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for issuing direction to respondents No.1 to 4 for registration of a criminal case against respondent No.5, who is alleged to have committed fraud with the petitioner.

I have heard the counsel for the petitioner and gone through the contents of the petition.

In the petition, it has been alleged that some amount was given by the petitioner to respondent No.5 through the commission agent on the pretext of sending the son of the petitioner abroad. Neither the name of the commission agent has been disclosed nor the date on which the said amount was paid has been mentioned. In my opinion, totally vague allegations have been levelled by the petitioner. In these facts and circumstances, I do not find the instant case as an exceptional case for issuing the aforesaid direction in exercise of inherent powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C. as in my opinion the petitioner has an alternative remedy as has been held by this

Court in ***Mithlesh Kumari v. State of Punjab***, 2002 (4) RCR (Criminal) 541 and by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Gangadhar Janardan Mhatra v. State of Maharashtra and others***, (2004) 7 SCC 768 and ***Minu Kumari and another v. State of Bihar and others***, (2006) 4 SCC 359.

Dismissed.

December 7, 2006 (SATISH KUMAR MITTAL)
vkg JUDGE